

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 188608

43

ORIGIN EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 EA-11 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

MBFR-04 SAJ-01 DODE-00 SS-15 NSC-10 H-03 EB-11 COME-00

IO-13 /147 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/NE:SDAWKINS:MHS

APPROVED BY EUR:GSSPRINGSTEEN

EUR/RPM:JKORNBLUM (DRAFT)

EUR/NE:NANDREWS

----- 034273

R 212136Z SEP 73

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY TOKYO

INFO USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

USMISSION NATO

ALL NATO CAPITALS

ALL OECD CAPITALS

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 188608

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: DA, EEC, NATO, PFOR

SUBJECT: EC DRAFT OUTLINE

1. DANISH AMBASSADOR BARTELS CALLED, AT HIS REQUEST, ON DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY SPRINGSTEEN SEPTEMBER 20 TO GET PRELIMINARY US REACTION TO DRAFT EC OUTLINE BARTELS HAD HANDED TO ACTING SECRETARY PREVIOUS DAY. BARTELS NOTED ACTING SECRETARY HAD SAID US WOULD STUDY OUTLINE AND WOULD RESERVE RIGHT TO CONSULT WITH ALL MEMBERS OF EC. THERE WAS A GENERAL FEELING, BARTELS NOTED, AMONG EC NINE AMBASSADORS IN WASHINGTON THAT US NOT IN AS MUCH OF A RUSH AS PREVIOUSLY. US NOW ACCEPTED NEED FOR AVOIDING PRECIPITOUS ACTION LIKELY TO BE DIVISIVE AND INCREASE TENSION AMONG THE NINE.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 188608

2. SPRINGSTEEN SAID IT TOO EARLY FOR EVEN PRELIMINARY US ASSESSMENT OF DRAFT. WE WERE NOW GOING THROUGH IT CAREFULLY. RE TIMING, US IS NOT TRYING TO STAMPEDE THE NINE. WE WILL LOOK AT WHAT CAN BE DONE WITHIN BOTH EC AND NATO CONTEXT ON SUBSTANCE OF ISSUES AND THEN DECIDE ON FURTHER STEPS.

3. BARTELS SAID, SPEAKING ON PERSONAL BASIS, ANDERSEN CAN GO INTO THESE ISSUES IN MORE DETAIL AT UN, BUT HE, BARTELS, BELIEVED IT IMPORTANT THAT US ACCEPT THE OUTLINE AS A BASIS FOR DISCUSSION, LEAVING OPEN POSSIBILITY FOR REVISION. DR. KISSINGER'S APRIL SPEECH CALLED FOR ONE DOCUMENT, NOW THERE WOULD BE TWO. HIS ORIGINAL THESIS CERTAINLY APPEALED TO SOME MEMBERS OF THE EC, BUT NOT TO OTHERS. IT WAS THEREFORE PROBABLY BETTER NOT TO REJECT THIS FIRST EC OUTLINE AND SUBMIT A US DRAFT. IT WOULD, IN FACT, BE HELPFUL IF US REPLY WAS IN FORM OF PARAGRAPH BY PARAGRAPH COMMENTS.

RE NATO, NOT MUCH HAD HAPPENED

4. SPRINGSTEEN SAID IT HAD BEEN OUR IMPRESSION NATO MEMBERS WERE WAITING TO SEE WHAT THE EC WOULD PRODUCE. REGARDING US HANDLING OF COMMENTS ON THE EC DRAFT OUTLINE, THIS WOULD DEPEND ON OUTCOME OF OUR STUDY OF THE DOCUMENT.

5. ON A NATO DECLARATION, SPRINGSTEEN NOTED THAT SEVERAL DRAFTS HAD BEEN PRESENTED IN NATO, INCLUDING MOST RECENTLY A CANADIAN DRAFT WHICH SOME MEMBERS APPEARED TO WANT TO USE AS THE BASIS OF DISCUSSION. SPRINGSTEEN SAID WE WERE NOW CONSIDERING A PROPOSAL MADE SEPTEMBER 19 IN NAC THAT DISCUSSION ON A DRAFT START NEXT WEEK.  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 188608

6. BARTELS SAID HE HAD BEEN SURPRISED TO HEAR SECRETARY RUSH SAY THAT US DID NOT LIKE HAVING TO DEAL WITH THE EC-9 AS A BLOC. HE NOTED THAT THE PROBLEM OF WHETHER OR NOT THE US, AS A NATO MEMBER, TOOK PART IN EC DELIBERATIONS IS A DELICATE ONE. IF THE US ALSO WANTED SIT IN WITH EC NINE, IT WOULD CAUSE SERIOUS DIFFICULTIES. HE NOTED SOME EUROPEANS COMPARED IT TO ALLOWING AN ELEPHANT IN THE

BED.

7. SPRINGSTEEN SAID THAT US ATTITUDE STEMS FROM OUR WISH TO AVOID BEING CONFRONTED WITH FAIT ACCOMPLI BY THE NINE. WE WISH TO BE ABLE TO CONSULT BILATERALLY. WE HAD HAD EXPERIENCE WITH EC COMMISSION WHERE WE HAD BEEN PRESENTED WITH ACCOMPLISHED ACTIONS AND HAD NO CHANCE TO MAKE OUR VIEWS KNOWN. WE HAVE FOUND IT IMPORTANT TO MAKE US VIEWS KNOWN DURING FORMATIVE STAGES AND WOULD EXPECT TO CONTINUE DO THIS WITH THE EC NINE IN THE FUTURE, AS IN THE PAST, UTILIZING BILATERAL CHANNELS.

8. BARTELS SAID THAT HE DOUBTED THE US HAD TO FEAR BEING FACED WITH A FAIT ACCOMPLI FROM THE EC NINE. CONTRARY TO POPULAR IMPRESSIONS, POLITICAL CONSULTATIONS AMONG THE NINE WERE STILL IN AN EMBRYONIC STAGE AND DIFFERENCES AMONG THE MEMBERS WERE NUMEROUS. IN BARTEL'S VIEW THE MAIN PROBLEM CONTINUED TO BE LACK OF COHESION RATHER THAN THE DANGER THAT THE US WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO MAKE ITS VIEWS KNOWN IN THE FORMATIVE STAGES OF EUROPEAN POLICY.

9. BARTELS REMARKED THAT NOVEMBER 15 SEEMED TO HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED AS A DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF WORK ON THE DECLARATIONS, ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT WOULD FOLLOW SOON THEREAFTER. SPRINGSTEEN NOTED THAT THE QUESTION OF A PRESIDENTIAL TRIP HAS NOT BEEN DECIDED AND WOULD NOT BE UNTIL NUMEROUS PROCEDURAL DETAILS ON MODALITIES OF MEETING ARE WORKED OUT IN ADDITION TO DETERMINING THE SUBSTANCE OF THE VARIOUS DOCUMENTS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 188608

10. BARTELS SAID THE DANES DEFINITELY DID NOT WANT A NATO SUMMIT BECAUSE OF THEIR DISLIKE FOR "CERTAIN" OF THE NATO PRIME MINISTERS. HE SAID THE US COULD BE SURE THAT THE FRENCH WOULD REJECT ANY SORT OF SUMMIT GATHERING. HOWEVER, GERMAN FOREIGN MINISTER SCHEEL HAD PUSHED FOR A SUMMIT DURING THE COPENHAGEN DISCUSSIONS AND IF BRANDT WAS DETERMINED TO PARTICIPATE, BARTELS THOUGHT THERE WOULD BE PRESSURE FOR OTHERS TO GO ALONG.

11. BARTELS ALSO NOTED THAT FOR REASONS HE COULD NOT UNDERSTAND, HIS AUTHORITIES HAD SHOWN GREAT INTEREST IN THE RECENT VISIT TO WASHINGTON OF DUTCH FOREIGN MINISTER VAN DER STOEL. BARTELS ESPECIALLY WISHED TO HEAR WHETHER THERE HAD BEEN DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE EC DRAFT DURING VAN DER STOEL'S TALKS IN WASHINGTON.

SPRINGSTEEN POINTED OUT THAT WE HAD NOT RECEIVED THE  
EC TEXT UNTIL AFTER VAN DER STOEL HAD ARRIVED HERE SO  
THERE WAS NO DISCUSSION OF ITS CONTENTS.  
RUSH

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 21 SEP 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** cunninfx  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973STATE188608  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** SDAWKINS:MHS  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS SPRINGSTEEN  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730917/aaaaampi.tel  
**Line Count:** 173  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ORIGIN EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** cunninfx  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 10 SEP 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <10-Sep-2001 by rowellE0>; APPROVED <24-Sep-2001 by cunninfx>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** EC DRAFT OUTLINE  
**TAGS:** PFOR, DA, EEC, NATO  
**To:** COPENHAGEN TOKYO  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005